UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,954	07/24/2003	Gerald G. Fagerness	ROC920030054US1	1614
30206 IBM CORPOR.	7590 03/22/201 <b>ATION</b>	EXAMINER		
	IP LAW DEPT. 917	SCHEIBEL, ROBERT C		
3605 HIGHWA ROCHESTER,	MN 55901-7829		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2467	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/22/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rociplaw@us.ibm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/625,954	FAGERNESS ET AL.			
Examiner-lineated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ROBERT C. SCHEIBEL	2467			
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Per</u>	nding			
(1) <u>ROBERT C. SCHEIBEL</u> .	(3)				
(2) Steve M. Santisi (Reg. No. 40,157).	(4)				
Date of Interview: 22 February 2011	Time: <u>1:30 PM</u>				
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:					
Claims discussed:  16-19  Prior art documents discussed:  US 2010/0020802 to Willis  Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet  Part III.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.					
/ROBERT C. SCHEIBEL/ Examiner, Art Unit 2467 (A)	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated that claims 16-19 would be subject to a rejection in view of Shtayer and Willis. Examiner and Applicant spoke several times in an attempt to find allowable subject matter to overcome the proposed rejection. However, Examiner and Applicant were unable to agree upon suitable allowable claim language. As such, Examiner indicated that an Office Action would be forthcoming to enable Applicant to consider how to overcome the prior art of record..